

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 6-8 have been amended herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended Figures 1-2, the abstract and the claims so as to address the informalities noted by the Examiner on pages 2-3 of the Office Action. Additionally, applicants have amended to specification to clarify that Figure 2 both shows the conventional art and serves to illustrate the environment of the present invention.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-5 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) based on *Dudziak et al.* Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 based on *Dudziak et al.* in view of *Chang*. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1, and similarly the other independent claims 7 and 8, as being anticipated by *Dudziak et al.* Applicants have amended claims 1, 7 and 8 in order to emphasize further the distinctions between the present invention and that which is described in *Dudziak et al.* A corresponding amendment has been made to claim 6 for consistency.

For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite, at a master component, generating timing signal packets containing timing signals at predictable intervals using a clock reference of a given frequency, and broadcasting or multicasting the timing signal packets to a plurality of client components over the packet network, preserving the timing signal packet intervals; and at each client component, receiving the timing signal packets and determining the intervals between successive packets, applying a

clock recovery algorithm to said determined intervals to recover in substantially real time the original clock frequency, and synchronizing the frequency of a local clock of the client component to the recovered frequency. Similar changes have been made to claims 7 and 8. Support for such changes is found, for example, in the present application in the paragraph bridging pages 6-7.

The claimed invention differs significantly from the teachings of *Dudziak et al.* in that the timing signal information is distributed across the packet network in the form of *timing signal packets* that are broadcast or multicast over the packet network. *Dudziak et al.* discloses an arrangement in which timing distribution takes place by means of transmitted data with *the underlying data signal* carrying the timing information. Thus, *Dudziak et al.* distributes timing information under the packet network. These two techniques are fundamentally different and *Dudziak et al.* fails to disclose the distribution of timing signals over a packet network by means of timing signal packets.

The present invention achieves a most significant and substantial advantage over the arrangement of *Dudziak et al.* In particular, the present invention is operative even with means for distributing the timing information provided only at the end nodes of the packet network. In other words, such means may be provided only at the original transmitting node and the ultimate receiving node and no special equipment is required at any of the intermediate nodes within the packet network. Thus, timing information may be distributed across an entirely conventional packet network without requiring any modifications to the network itself.

Dudziak et al., on the other hand, provides an arrangement which is only capable of distributing timing information if every node within the network involved in such distribution is modified to include the special equipment for implementing the technique of *Dudziak et al.* Thus, this technique of *Dudziak et al.* may only be performed if the whole packet network has been modified to include the specialized equipment. The technique of *Dudziak et al.* cannot be used with a conventional unmodified packet network.

For the reasons stated above, *Dudziak et al.* does not teach the present invention as recited in amended claims 1, 7 and 8. Nor does *Dudziak et al.* teach or suggest the above-noted advantages associated with the claimed invention. Furthermore, *Chang* does not make up for the deficiencies in *Dudziak et al.*

Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

II. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, all claims 1-10 are believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Mark D. Saralino/

Mark D. Saralino

Reg. No. 34,243

DATE: July 17, 2007

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113